

**Rural and Urban Streets and Roads Project Evaluation Criteria**  
**(on the Contiguous or AMHS System but Not on the NHS)**

Standards	Scoring Criteria				
	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
1. <b>Economic benefits</b> following construction.  Weighting: 2	Supports significant new, identifiable, permanent economic opportunities or benefits of statewide or interstate scope.	Supports moderate new, identifiable, permanent economic opportunities or benefits of regional or local scope.	Supports minimal, speculative or temporary economic opportunities or benefits or provides non-crucial benefit to existing economic activity.	N/A	N/A
2. <b>Health and quality of life</b> (Air and water quality, neighborhood continuity, access to basic necessities) Weighting: 1	This project provides a significant contribution to improved health or quality of life, or reduces or removes a significant existing negative factor.	This project provides a moderate contribution to improved health or quality of life, or reduces or removes an existing negative factor.	Project will have no affect either positive or negative on quality of life issues.	This project provides a moderate degradation to health or quality of life.	This project provides a significant degradation to health or quality of life.
3. <b>Safety.</b>  Weighting: 5	HSIP priority = 5 60% - 80% = 4 80% - 100% = 5	5% - 20% = 1 20% - 40% = 2 40% - 60% = 3	Less than 5% of project addresses safety.	N/A	N/A
4. Improves <b>intermodal transportation</b> or lessens redundant facilities.  Weighting: 2	Would clearly reduce the need for capital investment in another mode and result in a reduction in operating costs by reducing redundancy in our system or greatly improves the connection between modes for travelers or freight.	May reduce the need for capital investment in another mode and result in a reduction in operating costs by reducing redundancy in our system or would moderately improve the connection between modes for travelers or freight.	Does not impact other mode requirements.	May increase demand on another mode possibly requiring additional capital expenditure.	Will increase demand on another mode requiring additional capital expenditure.
5. Local, other agency or user <b>contribution to fund capital costs.</b> Weighting: 4	Contribution of state match, design, right-of-way, and/or materials: no point limit - 1 pt per each 5% of project cost.	Contribution of state match, design, right-of-way, and/or materials: 1 point per each 5% of project cost.	Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing.	N/A	N/A

\* This category may also be used to score roads of a similar character not on the contiguous system such as Nome-Council.

## Rural and Urban Streets and Roads Criteria (continued)

Standards	Scoring Criteria				
	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
6. <sup>a</sup> Local, other agency or user <b>contribution to fund M&amp;O costs.</b> (For non-DOT or DOT unsuited to long-term ownership) <i>For 1998-2000 STIP: commitment must be in writing before points will be assigned.</i> Weighting: 5	Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor will assume full M&O responsibility; or sponsor will assume full M&O of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor contributes nothing.  Continued sponsor ownership & operation of locally-owned facility = 1 pt.; And results in significant local maintenance savings = 2 pts.	N/A	N/A
7. <sup>a</sup> Departmental <b>M&amp;O costs</b> and priority (Use for DOT facilities.) Weighting: 5	Very high M&O priority.	Moderate M&O priority.	Not an M&O priority; little affect on M&O costs.	Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs moderately.	Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs significantly.
8. <b>Public support?</b>  Weighting: 3	Preponderance of public record including a resolution from the local elected body shows support for project and fully supported in official state or local plans.	Majority of public record shows support for project; and nominally supported in official state or local plans.	Public record is divided or undocumented toward project; and not supported in official state or local plans.	Majority of public record shows opposition to project; and not supported in official state/local plans.	Preponderance of public record shows opposition to project including a resolution from the local elected body and/or contravenes official state/local plans.
9. <b>Environmental approval</b> readiness.  Weighting: 2	Environmental approval likely with Categorical Exclusion or already complete.	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Assessment or draft document circulated.	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Impact Statement.	Environmental approval extremely difficult 50/50 chance.	Environmental approval unlikely.

a. Total points awarded for standards 6 & 7 is less than or equal to 5.

**Rural and Urban Streets and Roads Criteria (continued)**

Scoring Criteria					
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
10. <sup>b</sup> <b>Surface rehabilitation.</b>  Weighting: 4	Primarily 3-R and a PMS recommendation for rehab within 2 years, or a gravel surface badly deteriorated or serious surface deformation.	Primarily 3-R; a portion of the project addresses serious foundation problems.	Primarily major reconstruction; addresses longer-range rehabilitation.	N/A	-N/A
11. <b>Cost, length, AADT evaluation.</b> Divide project cost (in thousands) by length (in miles) and further divide result by Avg. Annual Daily Traffic. Weighting: 4	Between: 0 - 55¢ = 5 55¢ - 80¢ = 4	Between: 80¢ - \$1.10 = 3 \$1.10 - \$1.50 = 2 \$1.50 - \$2.50 = 1	Between: \$2.50 - \$3.00 = 0	Between: \$3.00 - \$4.00 = -1 \$4.00-\$6.00 = -2 \$6.00 - \$10.00 = -3	Between: \$10.00 - \$54.00 = -4 \$54.00 - ∞ = -5
12. <b>Deficient bridges.</b> Weighting: 3	Deficient bridge needing replacement*.	Deficient bridge eligible for rehabilitation**.	No bridge deficiencies	N/A	N/A
13. <sup>b</sup> <b>Deficient width/grade/alignment</b> Weighting: 3	Significantly deficient w/g/a relative to standards.	Moderately deficient w/g/a relative to standards.	No w/g/a deficiencies	N/A	N/A
14. <b>Functional class.</b> Weighting: 2	Major Arterial = 5 Minor Arterial = 4	Major Collector or Urban Collector	Minor Collector	Local Roads/Streets	N/A
15. <b>Other factors</b> not specified. Weighting: 2	Project exhibits significant innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	Project exhibits moderate innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	Project exhibits no innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	N/A	N/A

Total Weight = 47

\* “eligible for *replacement*” means the bridge has a sufficiency rating of less than 50 points and has been determined to be eligible for replacement by ADOT&PF Bridge section.

\*\* “eligible for *rehabilitation*” means the bridge has a sufficiency rating between 50 and 80 points and has been determined to be eligible for rehabilitation by ADOT&PF Bridge section.

b. Total points awarded for standards 10 & 13 is less than or equal to 5.